

This record is a partial extract of the original cable. The full text of the original cable is not available.

UNCLAS PARIS 005921

SIPDIS

SENSITIVE

FROM USMISSION UNESCO
STATE PASS USTR BALASSA
IO/UNESCO FOR JANE COWLEY
EUR/ERA FOR PETER CHASE
L/EUR FOR PETER OLSON

E.O. 12958: N/A

TAGS: [SCUL](#) [ETRD](#) [EU](#) [CJAN](#) [UNESCO](#)

SUBJECT: USUNESCO: GUIDANCE REQUEST: DISCUSSING THE
PRELIMINARY DRAFT CULTURAL DIVERSITY CONVENTION WITH
EU REPS

REF: PARIS 5116

1. (U) As reported ref, the UK Perm Delegate to UNESCO, Ambassador Timothy Craddock, suggested that USG lawyers meet with lawyers from EU member states so that the USG can better understand why the EU Member States have concluded that the preliminary draft Cultural Diversity Convention does not damage the financial and trade interests of EU Member States. Craddock emphasized that this would not be a negotiation but an information session that enable a better understanding of view.

2. (U) We have suggested the date of September 16 and request that US Mission Geneva Senior Legal Advisor T. Michael Peay, and an appropriate representative of the U.S. Trade Representative's Office be part of the team representing the USG.

3. (U) We see potential value in maybe having the Japanese delegation at such a meeting for additional leverage value. A senior lawyer from the Japanese foreign ministry will be in Paris on the 16th.

4. (SBU) We would welcome detailed instructions that address a range of procedural and substantive issues. As an initial matter, should the U.S. delegation seek to expand the scope of the meeting to go beyond the EU's stated premise? Should we seek to inform the EC that, in order to be meaningful, the meeting must also address U.S. problems with the current text and explore what might be possible to convert it to a more consensus-based text? Toward that end, after hearing their presentation, should we explore specific, Washington-cleared textual revisions that would arguably protect both our and their financial/trade interests, without calling the discussion a "negotiation"? What should we aim to achieve as the desired outcome from the meeting, insofar as enhancing protection of U.S. interests over and above the current convention text?

5. (U) We would appreciate Washington's consideration of these questions in formulating instructions.

Oliver